

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 2614.01US04 1177 10/698,036 10/30/2003 Kurt A. Seyfert **EXAMINER** 07/29/2005 PATTERSON, THUENTE, SKAAR & CHRISTENSEN, P.A. WATSON, ROBERT C **4800 IDS CENTER** ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **80 SOUTH 8TH STREET** MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-2100 3723

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					Thich	
		Application I	Vo.	Applicant(s)		
		10/698,036		SEYFERT, KURT A.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit		
		Robert C. Wa		3723		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	06 July 2005.				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL. 2b)	This action is non-	nis action is non-final.			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are vectorial claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1 and 5-7 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) 2-4 is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from cons				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ er No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/30/03</u> .	/SB/08) 5)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do Notice of Informal F	ate	)-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/698,036

Art Unit: 3723

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 5-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 respectively of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,775. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because when performing the method recited in claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,775 the lever tool moves the control arm away from the steering knuckle and it is inherent that such a separation of these two elements results in positioning the control arm in a biased position at the completion of the leverage operation. An auto mechanic skilled in the art would obviously recognize that a control arm is inherently biased toward the steering knuckle when these elements are separated.

Claims 2-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 8-9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 7/6/05.

Applicant's remarks concerning the election of species requirement have been given careful consideration. Inasmuch as the various species have mutually exclusive characteristics additional burdensome searches would have to be performed to examine the additional claims. The election of species requirement is deemed proper and is hereby made FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert C. Watson whose telephone number is 571 272-4498. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs., 5:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail III can be reached on 571 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 4

rcw

ROBERT C. WATSON PRIMARY EXAMINER